

### **REMARKS**

Claims 39-44, 47-49 and 59-67 remain pending in the present application. Claims 39, 42 and 47 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 39-44, 47-49 and 59-67 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Examiner states that Applicants' specification teaches that the arbor shaft cover prevents the arbor shaft fastener from vibrating off but it is not clear how it is done. The Examiner has apparently tried to scale the figures of the drawings to conclude that there is room for the fastener to vibrate off. (Fig. 13a and Fig. 8).

Figure 8 illustrates fastener 64 and movable lower guide 42 but it does not illustrate fixed upper guard 40 to which the arbor shaft cover 66 is attached. Figure 13a illustrates both lower guard 42 and upper guard 40, but does not illustrate the fastener. Clearly the two drawings are drawn to a different scale and any attempt to define features of the present invention by combining features of these two drawings is speculative in nature especially due to the fact that scaling of a drawing is improper.

This is especially true when the feature that you are trying to define goes directly against the teachings of the specification. Page 12 of the specification states that the arbor shaft cover 66 prevents the arbor shaft fastener 64 from vibrating loose and falling free of the arbor shaft 44. Thus, it is clear that the thickness of fastener 64 has to be large enough so that fastener 64 will contact arbor shaft cover 66 before it disengages

from arbor shaft 44. Any other dimension relationships would allow fastener 64 to fall free from arbor shaft 44 and go against the teachings of the specification.

Applicants have amended Figure 13b to show arbor shaft 44 and fastener 64 and the relationship with arbor shaft cover 66 which is inherently present due to the description of this feature on page 12 of the specification as originally filed. In addition, Claims 39, 42 and 47 have been amended to be consistent with the specification as originally filed.

#### **DRAWINGS**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Figure 13b has been amended to illustrate the feature of arbor shaft cover 66 preventing fastener 64 from falling free of arbor shaft 44. In addition, Claims 39, 42 and 47 have been amended to be consistent with the specification as originally filed. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brault, et al. '042 in view of Cotton, et al. '022. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The prevention, by the arbor cover, of the fastener from vibrating loose and falling free of the arbor shaft is not disclosed, taught or even suggested by the cited prior art. Brault '042 discloses an unnumbered fastener with no discussions regarding the preventing of its disengagement. Cotton '022 discloses a cover but no fastener. There is no basis, other than the Applicants' disclosure, for the Examiner to infer that

this feature is found in the prior art. Claims 39, 42 and 47 have been amended to be consistent with the wording of the specification as originally filed:

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 39, 42 and 47, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 40, 41, 43-46, 48 and 49, which ultimately depend from one of these independent claims, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 11, 2005

By:   
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 13b. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figures 13a and 13b, replaces the original sheet including Figures 13a and 13b.

Please amend Figure 13b by adding the arbor shaft 44 and fastener 64.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)